

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

**ANGELA CURRY McKINLEY,**

§

**Plaintiff,**

§

**v.**

**CASE NO. 6:22-cv-296-JDK-KNM**

**COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,**

§

**Defendant.**

§

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Angela Curry McKinley filed this appeal from a final administrative decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration denying an application for Social Security benefits. On February 27, 2023, the Court reversed the Commissioner's final administrative decision and remanded the matter to the Commissioner for further proceedings. Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Award of Attorney Fees Under the Equal Access to Justice Act. Docket No. 21. The motion was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact and recommendations for disposition. Docket No. 22. The Commissioner filed a response stating that he does not oppose the requested award of attorney fees. Docket No. 23.

On May 15, 2023, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court grant the application and award Plaintiff \$6,275.08 in attorney fees. Docket No. 24. No written objections have been filed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, the Commissioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 916 (1989) (holding that the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law" if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 24) as the findings of this Court. The application for EAJA fees (Docket No. 21) is **GRANTED**. The Commissioner shall pay Plaintiff for fees incurred totaling \$6,275.08 pursuant to the EAJA, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d), with the funds payable to Plaintiff and forwarded to Plaintiff through her attorney of record. The awarded fees consist only of attorney fees.

**Signed this**  
**Jun 12, 2023**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE